

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/004,399	10/30/2001	Thomas G. Cooper	017516-000130US	5886	
20350	7590 09/09/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			LEUBECKER, JOHN P		
TWO EMBA	RCADERO CENTER OOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANC	CISCO, CA 94111-3834	L	3739		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,399	COOPER, THOMAS	,
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	, N
	John P. Leubecker	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE		•	
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper replich places the application.	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ision and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>

John P Leubecker Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3739 Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's statement thanking the Examiner for "pointing out that the Madhani et al. reference (USPN 5,807,377) discusses methods of performing surgical procedures similar to those claimed in the instant application" is confusing since it has no basis. It is noted that no such position was taken in any Office Action. Perhaps Applicant is confusing this application with a different one.